



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/752,861	12/28/2000	Brad A. Davis	BEA9-2000-0015-US1	1468		
30011 7	590 01/14/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER		
	I & BRANDSDORFE NALD CHAPEL DRIVI	PORTKA, GARY J				
GAITHERSBURG, MD 20878		-	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2188			

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/752,861	DAVIS ET AL.	
Advicery Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gary J Portka	2188	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ado	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 December 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprunt of the fee. The approriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	•
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			•
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
10. Other:	•	Gary J Portka Primary Examiner	alka
		Art Unit: 2188	

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment in response to prior objection to the claims 9 and 18 removes the alternative language (selected from a group consisting of) and therefore narrows the scope of these claims.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: as previously stated the independent claims do not even require that the first and second descriptors be in the same computer, only that they be in the same system. Therefore, Examiner maintains previous arguments that it would have been obvious to incorporate the teachings of each reference that generate by firmware the first and second descriptors in a computer system, it is not required to motivate why an artisan would incorporate the generation of these descriptors in a single computer by a single firmware.